REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-29 are pending. Claims 16, 18, and 19 have been allowed, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 15, and 20 have been amended, and claims 2 and 17 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claim 15 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten into independent form to recite the features of its base and intervening claims. Claim 15 has been rewritten in this manner.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Julka-Lioy combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites that the base station controller "receives the specific message from the mobile station after receipt of a mobile origination message from the mobile station," where the specific message provides an indication of whether a dormant function is to be performed for the mobile station. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references,

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relied on Paragraphs [30]-[43] of the Julka publication. Here, Julka discloses transmitting an Origination message when a change of identification (PZID, SID, nor NID) occurs. Transmitting this message causes a series of steps to be performed that results in a dormant handoff operation.

Transmission of the messages to initiate dormant handoff is shown in Figure 3A. Here,

Julka shows that the Origination message is transmitted from the mobile station to the base

station controller (labeled, Target BS). However, neither Figure 3A nor any other portion of

Julka discloses that **after** the Origination message is received, a base station controller receives

another message from the mobile station, where the other message is "the specific message"

recited in claim 1 that provides an indication of whether a dormant function is to be performed

for the mobile station. (See, for example, Paragraph [59] of the specification for support).

To understand these differences more clearly, see Figure 3A of Julka which shows that

after the ORIGINATION MSG is transmitted from MS 40 to Target BS 20/24, the mobile

station does not transmit another message to the Target BS to inform the Target BS that the

mobile station supports a dormant function. Rather, Figure 3A shows that MS 40 subsequently

transmits an ENHANCED ORIGINATION MSG to the Target BS. This message merely

informs the Target BS of additional (i.e., unrelated) dormant handoff requests on a newly

assigned channel. (See Paragraph [40], lines 10-13).

Thus, turning to the claim language, claim 1 requires the transmission of two messages

from the mobile station to the base station controller. The first message is an Origination

Message and the second message is "the specific message." The specific message includes

"dormant control information received" from the mobile station which is used to provide an

indication that the mobile station is a type of terminal that performs a dormant function. The

Julka publication fails to teach or suggest that the ENHANCED ORIGINATION MSG, or any

15

other message transmitted from the mobile station to the Target BS after transmission of the

ORIGINATION MSG, includes dormant control information included in the specific message

recited in claim 1.

In addition to the foregoing features, claim 1 recites that the "base station controller

determines whether to conduct the dormant function without referring to protocol revision

information." (See, for example, Paragraph [44] of the specification for support). The Julka

publication does not teach or suggest these features. In fact, Julka teaches away from these

features when it discloses determining whether mobile station 40 supports multiple dormant

service instances based on protocol state information. (See Paragraph [33] of the Julka

publication).

The Lioy publication was cited for disclosing a dormant timer. However, Lioy fails to

teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Julka publication. Based on these

differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 7 recites features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the

cited references. For example, claim 7 recites "receiving information on whether a mobile station

supports a dormant function . . . based on a certain message different from a mobile origination

message transmitted from the mobile station to a base station controller" and "determining

whether to conduct the dormant function without referring to protocol revision information,

and based on service option information of the mobile station, a state of a dormant timer, and

dormant control information included in the certain message received from the mobile station."

These features are not taught or suggested by the Julka and Lioy references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants therefore submit that claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 20 recites features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the cited references. For example, claim 20 recites "receiving a message from a mobile station, said message received after receipt of a mobile origination message and including information indicating whether the mobile station supports a dormant function." In addition, claim 20 recites "determining whether to conduct the dormant function without referring to protocol revision information, and based on service option information of the mobile station, a state of a dormant timer, and dormant control information included in the specific message received from the mobile station."

These features are not taught or suggested by the Julka and Lioy references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants therefore submit that claim 20 and its dependent claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

17

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: April 7, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610